



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,291	09/16/2003	Chaitanya Dev Sareen	60001.0272US01/MS 301788.	2618
7590	03/26/2008		EXAMINER LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
Leonard J. Hope Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/26/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,291	SAREEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea N. Long	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,10,12,14,15,18-25 and 30-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,10,12,14,15,18-25 and 30-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Responses dated 01/04/2008, Applicant amended Claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 32, cancelled Claims 4, 8, 11, 13, 28 and 29, and argued all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 10/04/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-15, 18-25 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tom Syroid et al. (Outlook 2000 In a Nutshell: A Power User's Quick Reference, published May 2000, pages 15 and 244-252) hereinafter "Syroid" in view of Microsoft Outlook (2000), hereinafter "Outlook" in further view of Fortenberry et al (US Patent 6101485), hereinafter "Fortenberry".

As to independent claim 1, Syroid discloses the *method for providing a user interface for defining an electronic message handling rule* (p. 245 [003], p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses rules for automated message handling in an email system), *the method comprising, receiving a request to create an electronic message handling rule, wherein receiving*

the request to create the electronic message handling rule comprises receiving the request to create the electronic handling rule from a user interface button (p. 246 [004] [006] → Syroid discloses by selecting the Tools option to execute the Rules Wizard to create, modify or delete a rule); in response to the request, identifying a context in which the request to create the electronic message handling rule was received (p. 246 [004], Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses a description is provided to give details on what the rule does); and providing a user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule, wherein the contents of the user interface are customized based on the identified context (p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid displays a user interface which provides detailed rules).

Syroid does not explicitly teach the context corresponding to a user selecting an electronic mail message, wherein the identified context comprises a context comprising reading an electronic mail message and wherein the user interface button is displayed within an electronic message reading pane.

Outlook teaches a user selecting an electronic mail message (Figure 1 and 2) and while viewing the message (Figure 2 and 3) having the option of selecting an action to create a rule (Figure 3). When the action to create a rule is selected, the context of the message is populated to create a condition based on the context of the message (Figure 4). Outlook additionally teaches where a user interface button can be located at various regions of the Application, such as in the Actions menu (Figure 3), in the applications menu bar and opened electronic email message menu bar (Figure 5).

It is reasonable to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for GUIs within an email application) that the position of

the button can be located in a wide variety of locations within the application and electronic message at a user's preference for quick and convenient access. While Outlook does not explicitly teach the button being located in the reading pane, it is reasonable for a button to be present in the reading pane to perform a function similar to that of Fortenberry (Fig. 1, column 2 lines 21-55, column 4 lines 38-41), which provides user selectable buttons within an electronic message reading pane.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the message handling of Syroid with the corresponding context of Outlook and user interface buttons of Fortenberry to provide the user a simple and easily accessible yet effective method for creating a handling rule without the required inputting of context by the user.

As to dependent claim 2, Syroid teaches wherein *the customized user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule comprises one or more user interface objects for defining one or more conditions for the rule and one or more user interface objects for defining one or more actions to be performed if the one or more conditions are satisfied* (p. 244 [002], p. 247 [007] → Syroid discloses that the message handling system uses conditions and actions to create a rule).

As to dependent claim 3, Syroid teaches wherein *one or more user interface objects for defining one or more conditions for the rule are a subset of all of the possible conditions for the*

rule (Fig 6-17 → Syroid discloses in his figure that the conditions are grouped under a larger group of conditions).

As to dependent claim 5, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of a sender of the received electronic mail message* (p. 250 [013], p. 252 [018] → Syroid discloses that one of the conditions of setting a flag can be applied to a message sent from a specified individual).

As to dependent claim 6, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the received electronic mail message* (p. 250 [014], p. 252 [020] [022] → Syroid discloses that a condition could be based on content of a received message).

As to dependent claim 7, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of one or more intended recipients of the electronic mail message* (p. 250 [015], p.252 [019] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).

As to dependent claim 9, Syroid teaches the *one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of the intended recipient of the created electronic mail message* (p. 250 [015] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).

As to dependent claim 10, Syroid teaches the *one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the created electronic mail message* (p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses that messages sent which are created may set conditions based on specified words in the subject of a message).

As to dependent claim 12, Syroid teaches wherein *the one or more conditions for the rule comprise receiving an alert electronic mail message generated as a result of the alert subscription* (p. 249 [011] → Syroid discloses that a user-specified notification message is displayed in reference to an important message alert).

As to dependent claim 14, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface object for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the selected name* (p. 250 [013] [015] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).

As to dependent claim 15, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of a received electronic mail message* (p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses that a condition could be based on content of a received message).

As to independent claim 18, Syroid teaches *a contextually sensitive user interface for defining an electronic message handling rule* (p. 245 [003], p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses rules for automated message handling in an email system), *the user interface comprising, one or more user interface objects for specifying one or more conditions for the rule, the one or more user interface objects selected at least in part based upon a context in which a request to create the electronic message handling rule was received, receiving the request to create the electronic message handling rule from a user interface button* (p. 246 [004], Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses selection the Rule Wizard command from a user to create a condition for a incoming or outgoing message); *and one or more user interface objects for defining one or more actions to be performed if the one or more specified conditions are satisfied* (p. 244 [002], p. 247 [007] → Syroid discloses that the message handling system uses conditions and actions to create a rule).

Syroid does not explicitly teach *where the user interface button is displayed within an electronic message reading pane or wherein the identified context comprises a context comprising reading an electronic mail message*.

Outlook teaches where a user interface button can be located at various regions of the Application, such as in the Actions menu (Figure 3), in the applications menu bar and opened electronic email message menu bar (Figure 5). It is reasonable to one skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for GUIs within an email application) that the position of the button can be located in a wide variety of locations within the application and electronic message at a user's preference for quick and convenient access. Additionally Outlook teaches when the action to create a rule is selected the context of the message is populated to create a condition based on the context of the message (Figure 4).

While Outlook does not explicitly teach the button being located in the reading pane, it is reasonable for a button to be present in the reading pane to perform a function similar to that of Fortenberry (Fig. 1, column 2 lines 21-55, column 4 lines 38-41), which provides user selectable buttons within an electronic message reading pane.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the message handling of Syroid with the various locations of a user interface button of Outlook in addition to Fortenberry to provide the user a simple and easily accessible yet effective method for creating a message handling rule.

As dependent to claim 19, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of a sender of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading the electronic mail message* (p. 246 [005], p. 249 [010] [012] → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for incoming messages to read based on content of the message and the identity of the sender).

As to dependent claim 20, Syroid teaches *the one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading the electronic mail message* (p. 250 [014], p. 252 [020]) → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for incoming messages to read based on content of the message).

As to dependent claim 21, Syroid teaches *the one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of one or more intended recipient of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading the electronic mail message* (p. 252 [019]) → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for outgoing messages based on the intended receiver).

As to dependent claim 22, Syroid teaches *the one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of the intended recipient of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of creating the electronic mail message* (p. 252 [019]) → Syroid discloses that conditions can be set for messages created and being sent to an individual).

As to dependent claim 23, Syroid teaches the *one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of creating the electronic mail message* (p. 249 [009], p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses the conditions could be set for messages that he user creates based on the content of the message).

As to dependent claim 24, Syroid teaches the *one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the selected name when the context comprises the context of selecting a name* (p. 248 [008], p. 250 [013] → Syroid discloses that names can be selected from a database, with the selected names conditions can be set for that individual person or persons).

As to dependent claim 25, Syroid *one or more user inter interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of a received electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of selecting a name* (p. 248 [008], p. 249 [010], p.252 [020] → Syroid discloses conditions can be based on incoming messages with specified content and from a specified person).

As to dependent claim 30 and 31, Syroid teaches a user interface for creating message handling rules and having multiple buttons for performing functions within the user interface.

Syroid does not explicitly teach *wherein the user interface displays a simplified user interface containing a subset of all actions for defining the one or more conditions and the one or more actions for handling the electronic message; and provides a second user interface button, wherein the second user interface button is configured to provide an advanced user interface containing all of the possible actions to be performed and wherein the simplified user interface contains at least one commonly utilized action to be performed.*

Outlook teaches an organize pane which gives a simplified version of rules that can be implemented on messages (Figure 7). Further Outlook displays a second interface button “Rules Wizard”, that when selected will provide additional more advanced features for creating rules to apply to messages (Figures 7-9). This feature provided by Outlook is a well-known method to one skilled in the art to allow novice users to interact with essential and common functions within the user interface and provide expert users with advanced options to further customize rules, more commonly seen in a dialog box with an “Advanced” button.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the message handling rule interface of Syroid with the interface of Outlook to allow novice users to interact with essential and common functions within the user interface and provide expert users with advanced options to further customize rules.

As to independent claim 32, claim 32 recites substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 1, except that it is a system that implements the method of claim 1 with implicit devices as memory storage and a processing unit, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to claims 1, 18, and 32 Applicant asserts that the cited art fails to teach "wherein the identified context comprises a context selected from the list comprising one of the following: reading an electronic mail message, selecting a received electronic mail message, selecting an electronic mail message ready to be sent, creating an electronic mail message, creating an alert subscription, receiving a subscription alert, and selecting a name" and "providing a user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule, wherein the contents of the user interface are customized based on the identified context".

The Examiner disagrees.

Figures 3 and 4 of Outlook provide clear support for the previous limitations. The screen print provides one skilled in the art with the knowledge of having an electronic mail message open for a user to read. Upon selection of the Create Rule feature in the electronic mail message a graphical user interface is populated with the context corresponding to the opened electronic mail message in the conditions field. For example, the opened message was sent and received by Andrea Long, therefore the conditions are automatically populated with the from condition being from Long, Andrea N. and the sent to field being sent to Long, Andrea. Additionally the subject field is populated. Therefore the system takes into consideration the context in which the identified context comprises reading an -mail message and providing a user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule, wherein the contents of the user interface are customized based on the identified context.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
March 17, 2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100